

To: **Technology Center**  
Facsimile Number: (571) 273-8300

Total Pages Sent: 5

**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

From: **Robert N. Rountree**  
**Robert N. Rountree, LLC**  
Facsimile: 719-783-0990  
Phone: 719-783-0990

**AUG 31 2005**

# IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of: **Schmidl**Docket Number: **TI-30673**Serial No.: **09/635,146**Art Unit: **2666**Filed: **08/08/2000**Examiner: **M.J. Moore, Jr.**

For: **WIRELESS PACKET COMMUNICATIONS WITH EXTENDED ADDRESSING  
CAPABILITY**

## CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that the following papers are being transmitted by facsimile to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office at (571) 273-8300 on the date shown below:

*Robert N. Rountree*  
Robert N. Rountree, Reg. No. 39,347

August 31, 2005  
Date

## FACSIMILE COVER SHEET

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>FACSIMILE COVER SHEET</b> <input type="checkbox"/> NEW APPLICATION <input type="checkbox"/> DECLARATION (# Pages) <input type="checkbox"/> ASSIGNMENT (# Pages) <input type="checkbox"/> DRAWING AMENDMENT (# Page) <input type="checkbox"/> INFORMAL DRAWINGS <input type="checkbox"/> CONTINUATION APP'N (# Pages) <input type="checkbox"/> DIVISIONAL APP'N		<input type="checkbox"/> AMENDMENT (# Pages) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (4 Pages) <input type="checkbox"/> NOTICE OF APPEAL (# Pages) <input type="checkbox"/> APPEAL (# Pages) <input type="checkbox"/> FEE TRANSMITTAL (# Page) <input type="checkbox"/> REPLY BRIEF (IN TRIPLICATE) (# Pages)	
NAME OF INVENTOR(S): <b>Schmidl</b>		RECEIPT DATE & SERIAL NO.: <b>09/635,146</b>	
TITLE OF INVENTION: <b>WIRELESS PACKET COMMUNICATIONS WITH EXTENDED ADDRESSING CAPABILITY</b>		FILING DATE: <b>August 8, 2000</b>	
TI FILE NO.: <b>TI-30673</b>	DEPOSIT ACCT. NO.: <b>20-0668</b>		
DATE FAXED: <b>August 31, 2005</b>			
DUE:			
ATTY/SECY: <b>Robert N. Rountree</b>			

This facsimile is intended only for the use of the address named and contains legally privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient of this telecopy, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying or use of this communication is strictly prohibited. Applicable privileges are not waived by virtue of the document having been transmitted by Facsimile. Any misdirected facsimiles should be returned to the sender by mail at the address indicated on this cover sheet.

Robert N. Rountree, LLC  
70360 Highway 69  
Cottonwood, CO 81223

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 31 2005

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of: **Schmidl**Serial No.: **09/635,146**Filed: **August 8, 2000**Attorney Docket No.: **TI-30673**Examiner: **M.J. Moore, Jr.**Art Unit: **2666****For: WIRELESS PACKET COMMUNICATIONS WITH EXTENDED ADDRESSING  
CAPABILITY****INTERVIEW SUMMARY UNDER 37 CFR 1.133(b)**

August 31, 2005

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450I hereby certify that the above correspondence is being facsimile  
transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office on August 31, 2005.  
Robert N. Rountree, Reg. No. 39,347


Applicant requested a telephonic interview on July 26, 2005, between Examiner Moore and his Supervisory Patent Examiner to resolve issues presented in the attached PTOL-413A format prior to an appeal conference. On August 22, 2005, Examiner Moore called to inform Robert N. Rountree, Attorney for Applicants, that 1) he agreed with all issues submitted, 2) he would remove the final rejection, 3) he would submit an interview summary, and 4) he would issue a supplemental office action. A summary of that interview in the format of form PTOL-413 is given below as required by 37 CFR 1.133(b) when reconsideration is requested.

- (A) Application No.: 09/635,146
- (B) Applicant: Schmidl
- (C) Examiner: Michael J. Moore, Jr.
- (D) Date: August 22, 2005
- (E) Type: Telephonic

TI-30673, Page 1

- (F) Attorney for Applicant: Robert N. Rountree, Reg. No. 39,347
  - (G) No exhibit or demonstration was conducted.
  - (H) No specific claims were discussed.
  - (I) Prior Art: None discussed.
  - (J) The attached Interview Issues, faxed to Examiner Moore on July 26, 2005 were discussed.
- Applicant understands from their discussion that Examiner Moore agrees on all issues.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert N. Rountree  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 39,347

Robert N. Rountree, LLC  
70360 Highway 69  
Cotopaxi, CO 81223  
Phone/Fax: (719) 783-0990

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 31 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of: **Schmidl**

Attorney Docket No.: **TI-30673**

Serial No.: **09/635,146**

Examiner: **M.J. Moore, Jr.**

Filed: **August 8, 2000**

Art Unit: **2666**


For: **WIRELESS PACKET COMMUNICATIONS WITH EXTENDED ADDRESSING  
CAPABILITY**

APPLICANT INITIATED INTERVIEW REQUEST FORM

July 26, 2005

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

I hereby certify that the above correspondence is being facsimile  
transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office on July 26, 2005.



Robert N. Rountree, Reg. No. 39,347

Dear Sir:

The following Interview Request is submitted in the format of PTOL-413A. An interview is hereby requested with Examiner Michael Moore and SPE Frank Duong concerning the above-referenced application. The application is under final rejection. A Notice of Appeal was filed July 21, 2005.

Tentative Participants: Examiner Michael Moore, Jr.; SPE Frank Duong; Robert N. Rountree, Reg. No. 39,347, Attorney for Applicant.

Proposed Date: After August 8, 2005 when SPE Duong returns from vacation.

Proposed Time: AM


Type of Interview Requested: Telephonic

Exhibit To Be Shown: None

Issues:

	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
1) Whether claim 1 in combination with objected to claim 6 is patentable over Perlman et al. (USP 5,450,407).	[✓]	[✓]	[ ]
2) Whether original claim 16 in combination with original claim 19 is new matter.	[✓]	[✓]	[ ]
3) Whether independent claim 23 in combination with depending claims 24-25 raises any new issues.	[✓]	[✓]	[ ]
4) Whether independent claim 23 in combination with depending claims 24-25 would be different from claim 25 rewritten in independent form with the limitations of claims 23-24.	[✓]	[✓]	[ ]

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented: Applicant believes the arguments are self-explanatory as well-established matters of law. Please see the response dated June 24, 2005, for further explanation.



Robert N. Rountree  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 39,347

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner/SPE Signature